UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,503	02/06/2004	Michael E. McClurken	TLK019CON	6627
32047 7590 10/08/2010 GROSSMAN, TUCKER, PERREAULT & PFLEGER, PLLC			EXAMINER	
	MMERICAL STREET	,	PEFFLEY, MICHAEL F	
MANCHESTER, NH 03101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/08/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/773,503	MCCLURKEN, MICHAEL E.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Peffley	3739	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence address	
• •	VIC SET TO EVOIDE 2 M	ONTU(S) OD THIDTY (20) DAVS	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  Sply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02</u> /	August 2010.		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	is action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>37,39-62 and 69</u> is/are pending in th	e application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>52</u> is/are withdrawn			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>37,39-51,53-62 and 69</u> is/are rejecte	ed.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 February 2004</u> is/a	re∶ a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ o	bjected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	,		
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1. Certified copies of the priority documer			
2. Certified copies of the priority documer			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	•	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Burea  * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		received	
Coo the attached dotalied Office action for a lis	to the destined depicts not	333.704.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		)/Mail Date formal Patent Application	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	• •	

Application/Control Number: 10/773,503 Page 2

Art Unit: 3739

## Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 2, 2010 has been entered.

It is noted that claim 52 remains withdrawn from consideration and claim 69 has been newly added.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 37, 39-51, 53-62 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulier et al (6,096,037) in view of the teachings of Huitema et al (5,562,702) and Eggers et al (674).

Mulier et al disclose a device for clamping and treating electrodes, and specifically teach that providing an electrolytic solution from fluid outlets in the jaws will enhance the delivery of energy to tissue. Figures 4 and 5 show the electrode in the jaw member, the electrode having a plurality of fluid outlets for delivering fluid to tissue.

Mulier et al fail to specifically disclose a dimensional change sensor for measuring tissue thickness. Regarding the newly added limitation of first and second clamps each having first and second jaw members, Figure 12 discloses an embodiment that includes first and second clamps (i.e. upper and lower clamps) movable relative to each other, each clamp including first and second jaw members forming a loop.

Page 3

Huitema et al disclose another forceps device, and specifically teach that it is known to include sensors in forceps jaws for measuring tissue thickness (col. 9, lines 48-51). The Huitema et al forceps device may also include energy delivery means for treating tissue. Huitema et al fail to specifically disclose the type and placement of the thickness measuring sensor.

Eggers et al also disclose a dimensional change sensor (310) which is an ultrasound sensor that detects a change in the thickness of tissue as it is being ablated. The sensor is used to control the output of RF energy and alerts the user of changing tissue thickness to prevent creating too deep a channel in tissue (col. 23, lines 50-63). The examiner maintains the device is inherently a "shrinkage sensor" since the channel created by the device is creating a shrinking tissue area (i.e. channel) that is being detected by the sensor, and the sensor provides feedback regarding the shrinking of the tissue (i.e. the depth of the channel).

To have provided the Mulier et al forceps device with a sensor for measuring tissue thickness would have been an obvious consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art, particularly since Huitema et al teach that it is known to provide such sensors on forceps devices. To have further provided a surface mounted sensor would have been

an obvious design consideration since Eggers et al fairly teach it is known to use such a surface mounted sensor to monitor tissue thickness.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 2, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that none of the prior art shows the dimensional change sensor including first and second clamps, each clamp having a first and second jaw member. The examiner disagrees.

Mulier clearly disclose an embodiment (Figure 12) that includes first and second (i.e. upper and lower) clamp members, with each clamp member including first and second jaw members (i.e. first and second arms forming a loop). This embodiment allows for a cutting member to pass between the jaw members that are used to grasp tissue. Regarding the recitation that the dimensional change sensor comprises the jaw members, the examiner maintains that the entire jaw assembly may be termed the dimensional change sensor, just as applicant has chosen to do. That is, applicant's device is the same basic structure with a dimensional sensor located on the jaw assembly. Providing the Mulier device with the dimensional change sensor, as asserted in the above rejection, would result in the same basic structure.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Peffley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4770. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 7am-4pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,503 Page 5

Art Unit: 3739

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Peffley/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3739

/mp/ October 5, 2010